

76 03715
v.7
~~Appendix~~

CONFIDENTIAL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

OCT 4 1976

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
DEAN
JOSEPH D. LOHMAN
1910-1968

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
MAR 14 1969
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

Background Information
on the
San Francisco Juvenile Court

For Use of the Study Committee

Bay Area Social Planning Council
577 - 14th Street
Oakland, California 94612
Tel: 835-2300

February 1969

76 03715

v.7

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 14 2025

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

CODES AND STATUTES

District of Columbia Code, Section 11-914 (1961), now Section 11-1553 (Supp. IV, 1965).

New York Family Court Act (McKinney 1963), (McKinney Supp. 1967).

Vermont Juvenile Court Act of 1968.

Welfare and Institutions Code, State of California.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

Buddy Lynn Whittington, in Re: 389 U.S. 819 (1967, No. 701).

Commonwealth v. Fisher, 213 Pa. St. 48, 50, 53, 62, Atl. 198, 199, 200, (1905).

Contreras, in Re: 109 Cal. App. 787, 241, p. 2d., 631-633, (1952).

County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court, 17 Cal. 2d., 707, 712.

Gault, in Re: 387 U.S. 1, 1967, p. 16.

Jones v. Commonwealth, 185 Va. 335, 343, 38 S.E. 2d 444, 447, (1946).

Kent v. United States, 383, U.S. 541 (1966).

Krell v. Saunders, 168 Neb. 458, 96 N.W. 2d 218 (1959).

Macidon, in Re: (1966) 240 Ca.2d, 600, 610, 49 CR 861, 867.

People v. Lara, (1967) 67C 2d, 62 CR 586.

Poff, in Re: 135 F. Supp. 224, 225, 227 (D.D.C. 1955).

State v. Franklin, 202 La., 439, 333, 12 So. 2d, 211, 213, (1943).

State v. Johnson, 141 Mont. 1, 6, 374 P. 2d 504, 506, (1962).

Trimble v. Stone, 187 F. Supp. 483 (D.D.C. 1960).

ARTICLES, BOOKS, REPORTS, MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

ADAMS, Stuart. "Some Findings from Correctional Caseload Research,"
Federal Probation, Washington, D.C., December 1967, Vol. 31, No. 4.

Administration of Juvenile Justice in California. A Study of, Governors'
Special Study Commission on Juvenile Justice, 1960.

Administration of the Probation Department of the County of San Mateo,
Study of the, Griffenhagen-Kroeger, Inc., 1964.

ALLEN, F. "The Juvenile Court and the Limits of Juvenile Justice,"
The Borderland of Criminal Justice, Chicago, 1964.

Annual Report of San Francisco Juvenile Court, 1966.

Annulment of a Conviction of Crime - A Model Act, National Council on Crime
and Delinquency, New York, 1962.

ANTIEU, C. J. "Constitutional Rights in Juvenile Courts," Cornell Law
Quarterly, Spring 1961, Vol. 46, No. 3.

BARNETT, C. "Juvenile Court Philosophy in Practice," Southwestern Law
Enforcement Institute, an Institute on Juvenile Delinquency, 1962.

BEEMSTERBOER, M. J. "The Juvenile Court - Benevolence in the Star
Chamber," Northwestern University School of Law, Vol. 50, No. 5-, 1960.

BOCHES, Ralph. "Juvenile Justice in California: A Re-evaluation,"
Hastings Law Journal, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1967.

BRACE, C. The Dangerous Classes of New York, New York, 1880.

BUCKLAND, W. W. A Textbook of Roman Law, Cambridge, 1921.

California Mental Health Progress, California State Department of Mental
Hygiene, November 1967.

CANLIS, Michael N. "Now is the Time to Establish Youth Service Agencies,"
Journal of California Law Enforcement, Sacramento, April 1968, Vol. 2, No. 4.

CARLSON, Gordon. "Guidance Service Centers," Special Educational Services,
San Francisco Unified School District, 1967.

CARTER, Robert M., D.Crim., and WILKINS, Leslie T. "Some Factors in
Sentencing Policy," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police
Science, Northwestern University School of Law, Evanston, Illinois,
December 1967, Vol. 58, No. 4.

- Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, The, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.
- Children in the Courts - The Question of Representation (Newman, George, ed.), Institute of Continuing Legal Education, Ann Arbor, 1967.
- COBB, William L. Racial Estimates of Pupils Attending San Francisco Public Schools, Part 1, San Francisco Unified School District, October 1967.
- COOK, A. The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi, London, 1903.
- Cook County Family Court and Arthur J. Audy Home, The, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1963.
- Courts, Task Force Report on. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, 1967.
- Crime and Delinquency in California, 1966, Bureau of Criminal Statistics, State of California.
- "Criminal Law - Evidence: Pre-Waiver Admissions of Juvenile Inadmissible in Subsequent Criminal Trial," Minnesota Law Review, April 1962, Vol. 46, No. 5.
- DEAN, Martin, and HENRY, Alice. Child Guidance Services for the Year 1965-66, San Francisco Unified School District, September 1966.
- Detention Practice: Significant Developments in the Detention of Children and Youth, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1960.
- Directory of California Services for Juvenile and Adult Offenders - 1967, California Youth Authority.
- Directory of Juvenile Officers, California Youth Authority, Sacramento, 1967.
- DURANT, Will. The Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage, New York, 1954.
- EDELSON, E. Law Enforcement and the Youthful Offender: Juvenile Procedures, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1967.
- Family and Child Welfare Services in the Social Security Amendments of 1967, U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1968.
- FAUCONNET, P. La Responsabilite, Paris, 1920.
- FREED, Daniel J., and WALD, Patricia M. Bail in the United States: 1964, prepared for the National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice, 1964, co-sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Vera Foundation, 1964.

GEIS, G. "Publicity and Juvenile Court Proceedings," Rocky Mountain Law Review, Vol. 30, 1958.

GOUGH, Aidan R. "Expungement of Adjudication Records of Juvenile and Adult Offenders: A Problem of Status," Washington University Law Quarterly, April 1966.

Guides for Juvenile Court Judges, Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association in cooperation with the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, New York, 1957.

HEMPEL, Carl G. Science, Language and Human Rights, American Philosophical Association, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1952.

HENRY, Alice C. Annual Report of Activities of Child Guidance Services, San Francisco Unified School District, 1966-67.

HENRY, Alice C. and WOLFE, Elaine. Special Services Centers for Pregnant Girls, San Francisco Unified School District, 1967.

HUNT, Maurice and HALL, Perry. Planning for the Protection and Care of Neglected Children in California, August 1965.

ISAACS, J. L. "The Role of the Lawyer in Representing Minors in the New Family Court," Buffalo Law Review, Vol. 12, No. 3, June 1963.

Judges Look at Themselves: Profile of the Nation's Juvenile Court Judges, Center for the Behavioral Sciences, George Washington University, 1965.

Juvenile Court Committee, Report of. Bar Association of San Francisco, December 1, 1962.

Juvenile Delinquency, A Task Force Report on. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, 1967.

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime - Task Force Report, Report on Juvenile Justice and Consultants' Papers, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, 1967.

"Juvenile Delinquents: The Police, State Courts, and Individualized Justice," Harvard Law Review, February 1966, Vol. 79, No. 4.

"Juvenile Justice: Treatment or Travesty," University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 1950, Vol. 2.

KADISH, Sanford. "Legal Norm and Discretion in the Police and Sentencing Processes," Harvard Law Review, Vol. 75.

KEAN, A.W.G. "The History of Criminal Liability of Children," Law Quarterly Review, 1937.

KETCHAM, O. W. "The Juvenile Court for 1975," Social Service Review, September 1966, Vol. 40.

_____. "Legal Renaissance in the Juvenile Court," Northwestern University Law Review, 1965, Vol. 60, No. 5.

_____. "The Unfulfilled Promise of the Juvenile Court," Juvenile Courts, (Ketcham and Paulsen, ed.), Brooklyn, 1967.

KETCHAM, O. W. and PAULSEN, M. G. Juvenile Courts, Cases and Materials, Brooklyn, 1967.

LATOURETTE, K. S. The Chinese: Their History and Culture, New York, 1934.

LEMERT, Edwin M. "The Juvenile Court - Quest and Realities," Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime - Report on Juvenile Justice and Consultants' Papers, 1967.

LOU, H. H. Juvenile Courts in the United States, London, 1927.

LUDWIG, F. Youth and the Law, Brooklyn, 1955.

MacFADEN, Hon. William E. "Two Landmark Cases," Youth Authority Quarterly, Summer 1967.

MACK, J. "The Juvenile Court," Harvard Law Review, 1909, Vol. 23.

Management Manpower Requirements of California State Government, A Study of, Committee on California State Government Organization and Economy, February 1965.

Model Rules for Juvenile Courts, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Council of Judges, Proposed Final Draft, May 1968.

MYREN, Richard A. and SWANSON, Lynn D., Police Work With Children, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1962.

NEIGHER, Alan. "The Gault Decision: Due Process and the Juvenile Courts," Federal Probation, December 1967, Vol. XXXI, No. 4.

NEWMAN, G. G. "Children in the Courts - The Question of Representation," Institute of Continuing Legal Education, Ann Arbor, 1967.

NYQUIST, O. Juvenile Justice, McMillan and Co., London, 1960.

- OHLIN, Lloyd E., Ph.D. Sociology and the Field of Corrections, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1956.
- OLNEY, Warren. "Juvenile Courts - Abolish Them," California State Bar Journal, April-May 1938, Vol. 13.
- Opinion, California Attorney General, 51 Ops Calif. Attorney General, (1968).
- "Opinions of Trial Judges," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 14, No. 3, July 1968.
- O'SHEA, Don. "Evidence - Juvenile Courts Proceedings Held to be Civil in Nature and Hearsay Inadmissible," Notre Dame Lawyer, April 1964.
- PAULSEN, Monrad G. "Children's Court - Gateway or Last Resort?" Case and Comment, November-December, 1967, Vol. 72, No. 6.
- _____. "Fairness to the Juvenile Offender," Minnesota Law Review, Vol. 41, No. 5.
- _____. "The Juvenile Court and the Whole of the Law," Wayne Law Review, Vol. 11, No. 3.
- POLIER, Justine Wise. A View From the Bench, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1964.
- Population Projections to 1971, Stanford Research Institute, Research Memorandum No. 2, March 31, 1967.
- Population Projections for San Francisco, 1960-1990, San Francisco Department of City Planning, April 1968.
- POUND, Roscoe. Interpretations of Legal History, Cambridge, 1923.
- _____. "The Juvenile Court and the Law," National Probation Parole Association Yearbook, New York, 1944.
- Practitioner in Corrections, The, California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association, Arcadia, California, 1967.
- Procedure and Evidence in the Juvenile Court, A Guidebook for Judges, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Advisory Council of Judges, 1962.
- RUBIN, Sol. "The Legal Character of Juvenile Delinquency," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 261, January 1949.
- _____. "Legal Definition of Offenses by Children and Youths," University of Illinois Law Forum, Current Problems in Criminal Law, Vol. 1, 1960.
- Rules and Procedures, Police Department, City and County of San Francisco.

Salary Survey of California Probation Department, 1968, California Youth Authority, Sacramento.

San Francisco Youth Guidance Center, California Youth Authority and National Probation and Parole Association, 1951.

SAYRE, F. B. "The Present Signification of Mens Rea in the Criminal Law," Harvard Legal Essays, 1934.

SCHRAG, Clarence. "A Preliminary Criminal Typology," The Pacific Sociological Review, Spring 1961, Vol. IV.

SHEPHART, A. C. "Parens Patriae," California Youth Authority Quarterly, 1950, No. 4.

SHERIDAN, William H. "Double Jeopardy and Waiver in Juvenile Delinquency Proceeding," Federal Probation, December 1959.

_____. "Juveniles Who Commit Non-Criminal Acts: Why Treat in a Correctional System?" Federal Probation, Vol. 31, No. 1, 1967.

_____. "New Directions for the Juvenile Court," Federal Probation, Vol. XXXI, No. 2, June 1967.

SHERMAN, Edna. "The Role of a Juvenile Court Citizens' Advisory Committee," Crime and Delinquency, April 1968.

SKOLER, D. L. and TENNY, C. W. "Attorney Representation in Juvenile Court: A Survey of Juvenile Court Judges Serving the Nation's Largest Metropolitan Areas," Journal of Family Law, Vol. 4, Spring 1964.

Standard Act for State Correctional Services, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1966.

Standard Juvenile Court Act, National Probation and Parole Association, 1959, New York.

Standards for Child Protective Services, Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1960.

Standards and Guides for Adult Probation, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1962.

Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1961.

Standards for Juvenile and Family Courts, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, 1966, Washington, D.C.

Standards for Juvenile Halls, California Youth Authority, 1965.

Standards for Juvenile Homes, Ranches and Camps, California Youth Authority, Sacramento, September 1965.

Standards for the Performance of Probation Duties, California Youth Authority, Sacramento, 1965.

SUMNER, W. G., and KELLER, A. G. Science of Society, New Haven, 1928.

TALO, Thomas and WALLACE, Orlin. An Evaluation of the ESEA, Title 1, Reading Action Project at Log Cabin Ranch School, Summer 1967, San Francisco.

TAPPAN, P. W. "Judicial and Administrative Approaches to Children with Problems," Justice for the Child, Rosenheim, 1962.

_____. Juvenile Delinquency, New York, 1949.

_____. "Loss and Restoration of the Civil Rights of Offenders," National Probation and Parole Association 1952 Yearbook.

"Teen-Age Juries - Summary of a Report of a Study," Crime and Delinquency, October 1966, New York, Vol. 12, No. 4.

TEETERS, N. K. and REINEMANN, J. O. The Challenge of Delinquency, New York, 1951.

Think Twice Before You Build or Enlarge a Detention Center, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1968, 16 pp.

"Transfer of Cases Between Juvenile and Criminal Courts: A Policy Statement by the Advisory Council of Judges of the NCCD," Crime and Delinquency, January 1962.

Uniform Juvenile Court Act, American Bar Association National Institute on "The Changing World of Juvenile Court Law," May 3-4, 1968, Washington, D.C.

WAALKES, Wallace. "Juvenile Court Intake - A Unique and Valuable Tool," Crime and Delinquency, 1964, Vol. 10, No. 2.

WALD, P. M. "The Non-Delinquent Child," a paper presented at the American Bar Association National Institute on "The Changing World of Juvenile Court Law," Washington 1968.

"We Need Not Deny Justice to Our Children," American Civil Liberties Union, Greater Philadelphia Branch, Civil Liberties Record, February 1956.

WINTERNITZ, M. History of Indian Literature, Calcutta, 1927.

Youth Guidance Center, 1967 Grand Jury Report on San Francisco Juvenile Department.

A P P E N D I C E S

A P P E N D I X E S

- I Letter from Edward B. Shaw, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, Emeritus, School of Medicine, University of California; Consultant to BASPC on Health and Medical Questions Encountered in the Study of the Youth Guidance Center, San Francisco.
- II Ordinance 5924 (Series of 1939), City and County of San Francisco, Approved March 14, 1950.
- III Agencies and Institutions with Contracts with the San Francisco Juvenile Court to Provide Maintenance of Minors, Fiscal Year, 1967-1968.
- IV Institutions and Mental Hygiene Homes Used by the San Francisco Department of Social Services for Child Welfare Placements, 1967-1968.
- V Notes on Methods.
- VI Resource Persons.

APPENDIX I

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF PEDIATRICS

SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA 94122

April 19, 1968

Mr. Al J. Facca
Planning Consultant
Bay Area Social Planning Council
2717 North Main Street, Suite 9
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Dear Mr. Facca:

I am submitting this short and not detailed report of my visit to the Youth Guidance Center two weeks ago. Although this visit did not consist of a study in depth it did provide me with certain impressions.

There were certain things which seemed very good. The relationship of the children to the attendants seemed good and to an observable extent there was nothing to suggest a punitive approach. The head nurse, Mrs. Vidal, appeared to have a very good knowledge of all of the children and very excellent opinions about the present facilities and the need for improvement. I was extremely well impressed by the counselors although I had only a very short time with several of them.

There are numerous deficiencies. The place is unspeakably crowded with a usual occupancy far in excess of the rated capacity. It is extremely unpleasant to observe three boys in a room designed for two, rather crowded at that, with only two beds and a third boy sleeping on a mattress on the floor. Perhaps some of these are only for 24-hour stay but I am sure in many cases this degree of crowding is a continuous matter.

The personnel appears to be quite inadequate in amount. This is less than adequate for daytime but at night a single nurse is responsible for the entire Center, including the care of small babies and dependent children.

The care of dependent children in this Center is entirely inappropriate. The number of these children varies considerably but if all the beds available in this particular area were occupied this would require almost full-time attendance. Surely some other location can be sought for these children who are not delinquent and are only being boarded for future disposal.

APPENDIX I (contd.)

Medical care seemed adequate in quality but insufficient in quantity. Two half-time physicians cannot possibly do complete and careful physical examinations on all new admissions as well as taking care of infections and other situations which arise. At the moment these physicians are able to do little beyond a sort of quarantine-officer type of inspection but many of these children are physically or mentally sick. There should also be good provision for communication between the physicians who examine these children and the psychiatrists who must manage some of their problems so that therapy and general management can be carefully arrived at.

Recommendations: My tour of this institution was too brief for me to make detailed recommendations but certain things seem to be outstandingly necessary.

1. Nondelinquent, dependent children should be placed elsewhere and their care not incorporated in this institution.

2. A full-time physician is an obvious necessity so that each child may have a careful and complete physical examination to determine what corrections of physical or psychological problems can be afforded to improve the delinquent children. This will involve considerable expense because of the necessity affording an adequate salary for someone who is capable of assuming these responsibilities. At best this will be a difficult position to fill and this will require a physician who is not only able but also dedicated to this particular task. This will also require some improvement in the equipment for medical examination, including private facilities where the patient can be examined at leisure.

Perhaps these requirements for medical care are less important for those who remain only 24 hours or so but they are especially important in the case of repeaters. The girls present more of a problem than the boys because of the possibilities of pregnancies and of venereal disease which is not easily detected. I can see no good reason why the physician in charge of the girls must be a female provided there is adequate nursing staff but there may be strong opinions to the contrary.

3. There is great need for additional nurses. This, too, will be an expensive matter but the needs certainly justify this.

4. An increase in space is an obvious absolute necessity. The purpose of this facility is to help and rehabilitate these children, not to punish them, and the present crowding far beyond the proper capacity of the Center is at the expense of the personal dignity of these patients.

APPENDIX I (contd.)

Some improvement in laboratory facilities may be in order and probably be easily afforded. Most of these children should have a uranalysis as a part of a physical examination and many of them should have blood counts.

I was not impressed with the necessity for developing an infirmary for if crowding is decreased by affording more space, children with mild illnesses can be placed by themselves and more severe illnesses promptly referred to San Francisco General Hospital.

It has previously been advised that there be a medical advisory committee for the Youth Guidance Center. I believe this to be an excellent device by which to attempt to secure better care for these unfortunate children.

Very sincerely,

/s/ Edward B. Shaw, M.D.
Professor of Pediatrics, Emeritus

APPENDIX II

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ORDINANCE 5924 (Series of 1939)

CONFERRING ON THE PUBLIC WELFARE DEPARTMENT CERTAIN DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH SECURING OR PROVIDING FOR THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND FOR THE TREATMENT OF CHILDREN IN DANGER OF BECOMING DEPENDENT, NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT IN NEED OF SUCH SERVICES.

Be it Ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 61.1 of the Charter, in addition to the powers and authority now conferred on the Public Welfare Department of the City and County of San Francisco by law or by ordinance, the Board of Supervisors does hereby confer on the Public Welfare Department the following duties and functions.

The right and responsibility of securing or providing for the care of dependent children and for the treatment of children in danger of becoming dependent, neglected or delinquent in need of such services, provided that nothing herein is to be construed to prevent the Juvenile Court from exercising the jurisdiction in any cases requiring such action.

Section 2. Children may be assisted by the Public Welfare Department in their own homes or said department may provide or arrange for appropriate care and treatment for children in need thereof outside of their own homes. In connection with the care and treatment of children outside of their own homes, said department first must call upon an appropriate licensed private child placing agency engaged in the finding of homes for children and furnishing the necessary placement, care and treatment, and where in an individual case a licensed private child placing agency refuses or fails to render the services needed, said department may use other available resources for such services directly. When the private agency performs such services, it may be deemed, for purpose of administering public assistance to be responsible for the care of the child along with the foster parents with whom the child may be placed. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the placement and care of children in licensed institutions.

3-13-50: Passed by Board of Supervisors

3-14-50: Approved by Mayor

AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS WITH CONTRACTS WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE
COURT TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE OF MINORS, FISCAL YEAR 1967 - 1968

Name of Agency	Location	Licensed By			Auspices					Ages	Capac- ity	Rate ^{/A}	Comments
		Social Welfare	Mental Hygiene		Public	Non-Profit	Proprietary						
			Mentally Retarded	Mentally Ill				Boys	Girls				
The Albertinum	Ukiah (Mendocino)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	5-1/2-16	175	\$247.60	Children's Inst. (now closing)
Booth Memorial Home	Oakland (Alameda)	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	All Ages	47	435	Maternity Home
Boys' Town of the Desert	Banning (Riverside)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	12-16	65	389.24	Children's Institution
Boys' Republic	Chino (San Bernardino)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	14+	159	258	Children's Institution
Catholic Social Service	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	NA	NA	129	Child Placing Agency
Charter Oak Psych. Hospital	Covina (L.A.)	-	-	x	-	-	x	-	x	NA	75	465	Residential Treatment Center
Children's Garden	Mill Valley (Marin)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	6-12	6	350	Long-term care
Clear Water Ranch	Philo (Mendocino)	-	-	x	-	x	-	x	x	to 14	26	560	Residential Treatment Center
Convent of Good Shepherd	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	12-16	100	408	For Delinquent Girls
Episcopal Church Home for Children	Pasadena (L.A.)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	9-16	45	435	Children's Institution
Faith Home Teen Ranch	Turlock (Stanislaus)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	8-16	17	262	Small School Religious emphasis

(continued)

APPENDIX III (contd.)

Name of Agency	Location	Licensed By			Auspices					Ages	Capacity	Rate /A	Comments
		Social Welfare	Mental Hygiene		Public	Non-Profit	Proprietary						
			Mentally Retarded	Mentally Ill				Boys	Girls				
David and Margaret Home	Laverne (L.A.)	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	8-16	52	\$470	Residential Treatment Center
Florence Crittenton Home	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	NA	42	435	Maternity Home
Fouts Springs Boys' Camp	Colusa-Solano-Yolo	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	-	14-17	37	225	County Camp
Fred Finch Children's Home	Oakland (Alameda)	x	-	x	-	x	-	x	x	12-17	50	470	Residential Treatment Center
Guadalupe Home for Boys	Yucaipa (San Bernardino)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	10-16	20	435	Residential Treatment Center
Good Samaritan Home	Corona (Riverside)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	12+	46	464.38	Residential Treatment Center
Hanna Boys' Center	Healdsburg (Sonoma)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	10-16	120	354	Children's Institution
Holly Acres Training School	Applegate (Placer)	-	x	-	-	-	x	x	x	7-21	42	435	Mentally Retarded
Homewood Terrace	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	6-16	44	278	Eight Group Homes
Camp Owen Kern County	Kernville (Kern)	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	-	13-17	58	90	County Camp Section 881
Lakeside Lodge	Elsinore (Riverside)	x	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	13-16	68	435	Three Facilities

(continued)

Name of Agency	Location	Licensed By			Auspices			Sex		Ages	Capacity	Rate ^{/A}	Comments
		Social Welfare	Mental Hygiene		Public	Non-Profit	Proprietary						
			Mentally Retarded	Mentally Ill				Boys	Girls				
Lucinda Weeks School	San Francisco	-	x	-	-	-	x	x	x	4-21	21	\$ 230	Closed 10/31/67
McCobb Home For Boys	Los Angeles	x	-	-	-	-	x	x	-	15-16	20	421.67	16 Boys
Mount St. Joseph's Home for Girls	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	5-1/2 16	120	303.12	Children's Institution
St. Elizabeth's Infant Hospital	San Francisco	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	12-16	53	435	Maternity Home
St. Vincent's School for Boys	San Rafael (Marin)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	6-16	235	210.15	Children's Institution
San Benito School for Boys	Hollister (San Benito)	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	-	13-17	19	200	County Camp Section 881
San Francisco Boys' Home	San Francisco	NA	NA	NA	-	x	-	x	-	16+	35	289	Not subject to license
Stanford Lathrop Memorial Home	Sacramento (Sacramento)	x	-	-	-	x	-	-	x	H.S. Age	20	435	Children's Institution
Sunny Hills	San Anselmo (Marin)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	x	10-16	68	470	Residential Treatment Center
Lark Ellen Home	Azusa (L.A.)	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	11-16	70	439.48	Residential Treatment Center

^{A/} Fixed annually by San Francisco County Controller under Ordinance No. 166-67 which specifies that each rate be based on the past year's costs. This is an inhibiting factor in obtaining and upgrading the required services.

APPENDIX IV

INSTITUTIONS AND MENTAL HYGIENE HOMES USED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES FOR CHILD WELFARE PLACEMENTS, 1967-1968

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capac- ity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental/A Hygiene (3)			
Albertinum	Ukiah (Mendocino)	SW	-	Children's Institution	175	Boys and Girls 5-1/2-16 years
Bessie Ayccock	Sonoma	-	MR	Resident Facility	22	Boys to 21 years
William Bailey	Alameda	-	MR	Family Home	4	Children 3-10 years
Anna Barrett	Alameda	-	MR	Family Home	2	Children to 5 years
Atrienne Brown	Alameda	-	MR	Family Home	4	Girls to 12 years
Hortense Brown	San Francisco	-	MH/MR	Family Home	5	Teenage girls
Elizabeth Blalock	San Francisco	-	MH/MR	Family Home	5	Emotionally Disturbed
Ella Baskin	San Francisco	-	MR	Family Home	3	Boys Ambulatory
Cedars Devel. School	Ross (Marin)	-	MR	Resident Facility	75	Children 2-15 years
Charter Oak Foundation	Covina (L.A.)	-	MH	Treatment Center	75	Girls Adolescent
Cheri Mesa	Sebastopol (Sonoma)	-	MH	Family Home	6	Children 3-12 years
Children's Garden Home	Tamalpais (Marin)	SW	-	Group Home	6	Boys and Girls 6-12 years
Clearwater Ranch	Philo (Mendocino)	-	MH	Treatment Center	26	Children to 14 years

(continued)

A/ Institutions for mentally retarded are indicated in this column by "MR"; those indicated by "MH" are for the mentally or emotionally disturbed.

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capacity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental/A Hygiene (3)			
Sylvester Crockett	Oakland (Alameda)	-	MR	Family Home	2	Ambulatory, 4-12 years
D'Andrea Home for Boys	Sebastopol (Sonoma)	-	MR	Family Home	5	Children 9 years & older
Ruby Davie	Santa Rosa (Sonoma)	-	MR	Family Home	4	Girls to 16 years
Devereux School	Goleta (Santa Barbara)	-	MH	Children's Treatment Center	179	Ambulatory Boys and Girls 6 years & older
Dolores Dunlap	Santa Rosa (Sonoma)	-	MR	Family Home	6	Boys to 14 years
Edgewood	San Francisco	SW	-	Children's Institution	32	Boys and Girls 6- 12-1/2 years
Fred Finch	Oakland (Alameda)	-	MH	Treatment Center	50	Children 12-18 years
Golden Gate Respite Home	San Rafael (Marin)	-	MR	Family Home	4	Children to 21 Respite care
Guadalupe Home For Boys	Yucaipa (San Bernardino)	SW	-	Children's Institution	20	Boys 10-16 years
Barbara Guidotti	Alameda	-	MR	Resident Facility	37	Children & Adults 10 years and up
Hanna Center	Sonoma	SW	-	Children's Institution	120	Boys 10-16 years
Myrtle Harmon	San Francisco	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Cathy Heilman	San Francisco	-	MH	Nursery	6	Emotionally and Mentally retarded

(continued)

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capacity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental/A Hygiene (3)			
Hillside Home	San Pablo (Contra Costa)	-	MH	Family Home	5	Children to 16 years
Holly Acres	Applegate (Placer)	-	MR	Resident school	42	Children 7-22 years
Homewood Terrace	San Francisco	SW	-	Group Homes	44	Boys and Girls 6-16 years
Dora Hutman	San Francisco	-	MR	Nursery Home	6	Mentally retarded
Luella Jackson	San Francisco	-	MR	Family Home	2	Ambulatory Girls
Harriet Kneck	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	6	Girls up to 18 years
Laurel Hills	Sacramento	-	MR	NR	76	Boys & Girls
Betty Lee	NR	-	MH	NR	NR	NR
Ethel Leese	Cupertino (S. Clara)	-	MR	Family Home	6	Children to 14 years
Lincoln Child Ctr.	Alameda	SW	-	Children's Treatment Center	28	10 Boys 8-18 years
McCobb Home	Los Angeles	SW	-	Children's Institution	20	Boys to 16 years
Fay Manina	San Francisco	-	MH	Nursery	3	Crib cases
J.D. Medeiros	La Honda (San Mateo)	-	MH	Family Home	2	Long term
Marion Merriouns	San Francisco	-	MR	Nursery	6	Crib cases

(continued)

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capacity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental Hygiene/A (3)			
Irma Moore	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	4	Children to 14 years
Ming Quong	Los Gatos	SW	-	Children's Institution	54	Children 6-12 years
Alberta Mitchell	San Francisco	-	MR	Family Home	5	Boys 3-14 years
Mt. St. Joseph's	San Francisco	SW	-	Children's Institution	120	Girls 5-1/2-16 years
Yvonne Nichols	Contra Costa	-	MR	Family Home	4	Girls 6-12 years
Saida Nikolausen	Modesto (Stanilaus)	-	MR	Nursery	6	Crib cases
Mathilda Nutting	San Mateo	-	MR	Nursery	33	Crib cases
O'Gorman	Oakland (Alameda)	-	MR	Nursery	6	Crib cases
Helen Phenix	Solano	-	MR	Family Home	5	Children 6-18 years
Pleasant Creek Home	San Jose (S. Clara)	-	MR	Family Home	4	Children less than 16
Plumfield Inc. /B	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	12	Children 5-12 years

(continued)

B/ There are four Plumfields - one for day care for 20 children and another for six ambulatory children, both in Sebastopol. The two in Santa Rosa are family homes for six and five ambulatory children respectively.

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capacity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental Hygiene/A (3)			
Lois Poppleton	Santa Clara	-	MH	NR	6	NR
Myrtle Price	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	6	Boys 4-10 years
Porters Home	Berkeley (Alameda)	-	MR	Family Home	6	Boys to 16 years
Roffins Home	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	5	NR
Dorothea Romankiew	Alameda	-	MH	Family Home	6	Teenage boys
Roses Home For Boys	Sonoma	-	MR	Family Home	3	Males
Sacramento Children's Home	Sacramento	SW	-	Children's Institution	58	Boys and Girls 6-16 years
St. Elizabeth's	San Francisco	SW	-	Maternity Home	53	Unmarried Pregnant Girls
St. Vincent School For Boys	San Rafael (Marin)	SW	-	Children's Institution	235	Boys 6-16 years
Eva Sanders	San Francisco	-	MH	Family Home Mentally ill	6	Adults ambulatory
San Francisco Boys' Home	San Francisco	-	-	Group Home	35	Boys 16-18 years
Virgil Sheets	Santa Clara	-	-	-	-	Closed
Sierra Home	Stockton (S.Joaquin)	SW	-	Group Home	6	Children 6-16
Stanford Lathrop	Sacramento	SW	-	Congregate Institution	20	High school age

(continued)

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

Name of Institution or Licensee	Location (1)	Licensed By		Classification (4)	Capacity (5)	Type of Child Admitted (6)
		Social Welfare (2)	Mental Hygiene/A (3)			
Sunny Hills	San Anselmo (Marin)	SW	-	Residential Treatment	68	Boys & Girls 10-16 years
Mae Whiting	San Francisco	-	MH	Nursery	6	Babies
Gertrude Wilson	Napa	-	MR	Family Home	3	Ambulatory Boys-to 16
Nell Wilson	Alameda	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

APPENDIX V

NOTES ON METHODS

This brief overview of methods deals with the following questions about the Juvenile Court Study: (1) the qualifications and assignments of the personnel of the Bay Area Social Planning Council; (2) the methods of gathering data; (3) the limitations of the methods. These purposes exclude consideration of methods employed by secondary sources, which are themselves authoritative and deal with their respective methods in full detail. Similarly the purpose excludes consideration of methods of analyzing and summarizing the law, as well as the methods of developing standards published by governmental and non-governmental agencies. These standards are already well-known, if not universally accepted, and are available in public documents. Technicalities of mathematical statistics are not utilized in the study, for no tests of significant differences and no computations of sampling errors were necessary owing to the fact that, where such tests might have been important, total enumerations were utilized.

A. Qualifications and Assignments of Personnel

The scope and complexity of the study necessitated a division of the tasks and a major re-deployment of staff. Between January and July, 1968, all offices except the Marin County BASPC office /1 contributed members to the study team. Five persons from the Regional office in Oakland, two from the Alameda, one from the Contra Costa, three from the San Francisco, and one from the San Mateo office were given major responsibilities for the development of background

1/ The Marin office, consisting of a County Director only, had no deployable staff.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

material. Other members of the staff were deployed as necessary for special tasks. The available staff complement included one Ph.D in Sociology, one Ph.D in Social Service Administration, one Doctorate in Social Work, 10 Masters in Social Work, one Masters in Criminology and Sociology, and one Masters in Law. In experience, these persons had the following backgrounds: Law enforcement; probation services; prevention, treatment and control of delinquency; settlement house work; supervision of units in residential treatment centers; operation of resident centers for disturbed and delinquent youngsters; studies of problems in mental health; work in departments of public welfare, departments of public health, and in family service agencies; work with national youth-serving agencies. Other expertise when necessary; e.g. in law, medicine, foster care, and architecture, was called upon to complement or to supplement staff work.

Given the limited time available for completion of the study, its division into smaller units was essential. The division resulted in 13 sub-studies focusing on significant points of contact between the system and the minor.

The sub-studies, some of which provided data for more than one chapter of the report, were as follows:

Juvenile Court Law	Boys' Ranches
Administration	Dependency System
Police	Health
Probation	Inter-agency Relationships
Juvenile Hall	Clientele (minors and family)
Physical Plant	Population Projections
Race Relations	

APPENDIX V (contd.)

Staff assignments in these sub-studies were compatible with professional education and experience. Overall responsibility as study director was given to the staff member who had experience in probation and police services and held an advanced degree in criminology and sociology. The study director also undertook major responsibility for four of the sub-studies: Administration, probation, police, and Juvenile Hall and Boys' Ranches. Similarly, experience and education were considered in the remaining assignments of sub-studies to team members. Since no staff members had the education or training to evaluate the physical plant, this study was done by an architectural consultant. Similar consultative services were provided by an authority on foster care from the U.S. Children's Bureau, and by a pediatrician, regarding their respective areas of expertise. Each team member took on responsibility for the entire task assigned to him - planning, design of recording instruments, observing or interviewing, and reporting. Each team member obtained aid as needed from other team members, who, on such occasions, would be drawn away from their own assignment temporarily. Coordination of such shifts was another responsibility of the study director. For the study of the clientele (minors and their families), the employment of additional interviewers was necessary. The remaining routine but monumental jobs of editing, coding, and tabulating of the research instruments, and of editing, typing, printing, collating, and assembling of final reports were performed by permanent staff at the Regional office.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

B. Methods of Gathering Data

The focus of the study was on the juvenile under 18 years of age who, for one or more reasons, came into contact with the system of juvenile justice in San Francisco. The methods of gathering data included non-structured interviews, non-participant observation, interview schedules, mailed questionnaires, official records, and documentary sources. Except for official records and documentary sources, the following brief descriptions of each method include its date of application, definition of the study population, selection of study individuals, and a summary of the areas of discussion in any interviews.

Non-Structured Interviews

Between October and December 1967, the study team conducted a series of exploratory interviews with approximately 90 individuals and organizations. Their names were obtained from such sources as local publicity about delinquency problems, authorship of articles in journals or newspapers, referrals by interviewees, and through official occupations or position titles. Although most of these persons were residents of San Francisco, some resided in other Bay Area counties, and a few, in counties as distant as Sacramento.

The purpose was to obtain competent views on what the study should examine. After each interview a summary of the main points of discussion was written. A careful review of these summaries yielded 79 critical questions which influenced both the design of the study and the subsequent construction of data-gathering instruments. By the end of May 1968, approximately 100 more such interviews were conducted and similarly summarized and studied.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

In brief, all known parties at interest were interviewed, whether they were in favor of or opposed to the present philosophy and administration of the San Francisco Juvenile Court.

From March 1 through May 15, non-structured interviews were held with 75 persons responsible for conditions affecting the health and safety of the minors. The purpose was to ascertain the organization and administration of health care both before and after March 1, 1968. On this date, the Board of Supervisors transferred responsibility for the health program from the Youth Guidance Center to the Health Department of the City and County of San Francisco. Interviewed were:

1. In Juvenile Hall - medical, dental, and psychiatric clinic personnel.
2. In the Probation Department - all administrative personnel directly or indirectly associated with health services. This included:

Superintendent of Juvenile Hall

Supervisor of Training and In-service Education

Statistical Department

Business Administration Department

Chief Probation Officer of Girl Intake

3. In the Youth Guidance Center - personnel responsible for the environmental health and safety. This included:

Supervisor of Building and Engineering

Janitorial Foreman

APPENDIX V (contd.)

Laundry Foreman

Food Services Chef

4. In San Mateo County - the directors of the Log Cabin and the Hidden Valley Ranches, and the physician under contract for medical services (telephone interview).
5. In the Health Department of the City and County of San Francisco - the medical staff assigned by the Health Officer to be administratively responsible for the medical, psychiatric, and environmental health services at the Youth Guidance Center.
6. In the San Mateo County Health Department - the director and a staff member responsible for Dairy and Environmental Health Inspection at Hidden Valley and Log Cabin Ranches.
7. In the Contra Costa and the Alameda County Juvenile Departments - the Nursing and Medical personnel (telephone interview to obtain data for purposes of comparison).

Questions concerned the availability, accessibility, comprehensiveness, and quality of health care services.

Non-Participant Observation

The study team and members of the Study Committee were given several formal opportunities to observe the inner workings of the Youth Guidance Center. Between February 14 and May 10, 1968, three separate site visits were made to the Center facility in San Francisco; and on May 17 and on July 11, 1968, site visits were made to the Court-operated Boys' Ranches in San Mateo County.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

The purpose was to introduce the study personnel to the staff of the Youth Guidance Center, and to familiarize members of the Study Committee with the physical and social environment to which the background data would refer. Beyond these formal site visits, involving extensive guided tours of the various wings, floors, sections and departments, innumerable informal occasions arose when the members of the study team could absorb the daily routine of the institution while gathering information on their assignments. Such experiences could not be systematically recorded, compared, and tabulated, but were nevertheless essential to the development of insights into the meaning of, and ways of dealing with, the information gathered. Consultants also made site visits for special purposes. The architect's study involved two trips through the physical plant of the Youth Guidance Center and several trips to other counties to obtain data for comparative purposes. The medical consultant's evaluation involved on-site inspections of the medical care facilities.

Considerably more structured was the observation and recording of the experiences of the minor during the intake process. During the 8 a.m. to midnight portion of each day from April 20 through April 26, 1968, minors brought to, or appearing at, the Youth Guidance Center, passed through the intake process while BASPC staff carefully watched and filled in an observation form. During the hours between midnight and 8 a.m., when regular intake staff of the Juvenile Guidance Center was not on duty, staff of the BASPC study team made sporadic observations of the intake process, and filled in the observation form on these cases also. The dates chosen for the period of observation had no particular significance except convenience. Also, one week was the longest period of observation possible within the deadlines of the study. The form

APPENDIX V (contd.)

provided space to note systematically such matters as the division of the Youth Guidance Center in which intake took place; the source of referral; the characteristics of the minors; the presence or absence of the parent or guardian; the existence or non-existence of a police report; and protection of the minor's legal rights.

At the conclusion of the period of observation, the forms were checked for consistency and accuracy. They were then coded and tabulated.

Interview Schedules

Personal, face-to-face interviews were held (1) with the total available professional staff of the Youth Guidance Center (including Juvenile Hall staff) and the two boys' ranches; (2) appropriate personnel in related community agencies; (3) with members of the Juvenile Justice Commission; and (4) with the clientele (minors and their families.) The professional staff were administrators, probation officers, and counselors. The interview recording forms, or schedules, were accordingly divided into parts. The first part was made up of 37 questions for all professional staff, and concerned identification data, education and experience, and job performance. The second part included questions directed toward the specific tasks of each type of professional.

During March 1968, the 16 administrators, including the Chief Probation Officer and his aides, were seen by appointment and interviewed. The 55 questions directed to them concerned such matters as staff size, adequacy of funding, staff relationships, community relationships, staff upgrading, and, for the institutional directors, several questions about services offered in education, recreation, and the like.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

From February 26 through February 29, 67 probation officers and seven supervisors were interviewed. This represented complete coverage except for one probation officer who was ill. Six team members averaged about 14 interviews each, completing three to four interviews each day. The 66 questions addressed to the 67 line probation officers concerned caseloads, characteristics of the minors in their caseloads, case conferences, perception of their jobs, and other relevant topics.

Among these questions, two concerned the probation officers' judgments on the proper disposition of two hypothetical cases. These judgments, and the supporting rationales of the probation officers, were subsequently evaluated and graded by three resource persons who had experience in probation and the law. The grades utilized the undergraduate academic scale from "A" (excellent) to "F" (failed):

$\frac{1}{A}$	$\frac{2}{-A}$	$\frac{3}{B+}$	$\frac{4}{B}$	$\frac{5}{-B}$	$\frac{6}{C+}$	$\frac{7}{C}$	$\frac{8}{-C}$	$\frac{9}{D+}$	$\frac{10}{D}$	$\frac{11}{-D}$	$\frac{12}{F}$
---------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------

The resource persons were a consultant from the California Youth Authority (a former probation officer); a senior deputy probation officer from Alameda County; and a professor emeritus of law from the University of Minnesota. Each questionnaire response was independently read and graded. The three grades, if different for any given questionnaire, were averaged into a single letter grade by use of numerical values for the grades. Among the 67 probation officers were 17 who did not carry a probation caseload; therefore, these officers did not give judgments on the two hypothetical cases.

The 89 counselors in the Juvenile Hall and the 15 in the two boys' camps, were interviewed beginning March 11, 1968. Seven team members averaged 15 interviews each. The 31 questions specific to each counselor's interview were

APPENDIX V (contd.)

directed toward his duties; number of minors under his supervision; disciplinary measures; characteristics of the minors under his supervision; and types of programs such as rehabilitative, religious, recreational, and educational.

From May 1 through June 10, 53 structured interviews on interagency relationships were conducted with the appropriate supervisory personnel including special educational services of the San Francisco Unified School District, and of the schools under the Catholic Archdiocese; with the principals of schools in poor neighborhoods; with executive or supervisory heads of the relevant divisions of the San Francisco Department of Social Services; with top level personnel of a range of voluntary child welfare institutions and agencies; with community psychiatric clinics; and with group work and recreation agencies. Ten different forms were involved because the questionnaires had to be adapted to each type of agency. In general, questions concerned the existence of written agreements with the Court on methods of procedure; nature of the relationship with the Court; difficulties existing in the relationship; and the services provided by the agency, with added detail specific to the nature of the services provided.

From September 15 through 30, ten of the 13 members of the Juvenile Justice Commission were interviewed by a member of the study team. Concerning the three remaining members, one position was vacant, and two members were inaccessible. Questions concerned how members perceived their role on the Commission; how they implemented it; whether a conflict existed in regard to the watchdog role and their appointment by the Superior Court Judge; and how long each had served on the Commission.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

From May through July 1968, a group of delinquents, predelinquents, and dependents were selected for interviewing. During the calendar year 1967, there were 9,708 intake referrals to the Probation Department. The objective was to interview in person approximately two percent of this number, or something over 200 minors. The purpose was limited to learning about the court-related processes experienced by this particular group of minors without drawing from the resulting data any statistical inferences about the total probation caseload, the total Youth Guidance Center population, or the total juveniles in placement. The selection of cases, therefore, was based on a modified quota sample, with strata defined in terms of intake actions and the subsequent events possible, including experience with living in their own homes, in foster homes, or in institutions. Assigned quotas for each stratum were based on the proportion it bore to all other strata in the statistics for 1967, with one major exception; that is, fewer cases closed at intake were assigned than the 50 percent required for a proportionate quota. The assumption was that time would be better spent on minors who had been under the jurisdiction of the Court. For the Juvenile Hall stratum, records were centrally filed, and interviewers, who had access to all seven buildings of the Youth Guidance Center, chose the cases to be interviewed. The same procedure applied to the stratum concerning the cottages for dependents. For cases in other strata, records were not centrally filed at the Juvenile Court. Concerning some of these, a member of the BASPC staff, accompanied by the statistician for the Youth Guidance Center, visited the various offices in which the records were kept and selected from these the number required. In the case of certain other strata, interviewers had to requisition records without a preliminary

APPENDIX V (contd.)

examination, but carefully screened them to assure their appropriateness for the study.

For all cases, the four following criteria were applied: (1) geographical accessibility; that is, within the five-county Bay Area; (2) adequate maturity to respond to the interview; that is, at least eight years of age; (3) referral subsequent to the major revisions of San Francisco's Juvenile Court law in 1961; (4) a sufficiently long experience with judicial processes to reveal a rehabilitative program, except in the stratum where minors were dismissed at intake. Inasmuch as the cases eliminated by these criteria had to be replaced, the number of cases finally selected for interviewing in each stratum was smaller than the total number examined.

To obtain the 221 cases that were eventually interviewed, 305 case records were drawn from the Youth Guidance Center files and evaluated. Eighty-four of the 305 had to be eliminated from the study for the following reasons:

Total	305
Cases eliminated:	84
1. Unable to locate; moved, no forwarding address; not known at address; no such address; currently out of area; no one at home after four visits	60
2. Refused to be interviewed	11
3. Unsuitable for interview; under eight years of age; emotional instability; mental retardation; language problem	13
Interviews completed	221

APPENDIX V (contd.)

Cases were traced to locations distributed over the five-county Bay Area. In outlying areas, interviewers had to make as many as four visits before a family member was available for an interview. During the three-month period, approximately 72 percent of the 305 cases were successfully interviewed.

The interviewed minors came from the following strata in about the numbers indicated.

Total	305
Not interviewed	84
Interviewed:	221

Delinquents and predelinquents:

Under supervision of the Probation Department

-- in their own homes	47
-- in foster homes	23
-- in institutions	9
-- in county camps	8

Graduates from the boys' ranches under supervision of the Probation Department, in their own homes . . . 6

Dependents under the supervision of:

-- the Probation Department, in their own homes .	18
-- Catholic Social Service	3
-- San Francisco Department of Social Services .	32
-- Institutions (while in the institution). . .	11

Minors in Juvenile Hall:

-- awaiting placement under the supervision of the Probation Department	35
-- in temporary custody on "730" commitments <u>A</u> .	1

Minors whose cases:

-- were closed at intake; admonished and dismissed	11
-- were placed on informal supervision	7
-- adjudicated and not sustained	10

A/Commitments to Juvenile Hall.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

These strata were set up chiefly to insure diversity of experience among minors selected for interviewing. Since they were not intended for use as categories in tabulation, the reported frequencies are approximate rather than exact. However, so far as the interviewers could judge, within the group of 305 case records they had time to examine, they located no cases that were closed at intake and referred to another agency. They found only one minor in Juvenile Hall in temporary custody on a "730" commitment and only three dependents under the supervision of Catholic Social Service. The largest proportion (70 percent) of interviewed cases were either delinquents at home or in foster homes under the supervision of the Probation Department, or dependents in their own homes under the supervision of the Probation Department or the San Francisco Department of Social Services, or minors in Juvenile Hall awaiting placement under the supervision of the Probation Department.

Because of the time required to trace each individual for interviewing, BASPC interviewers were supplemented with temporary help recruited for this specific purpose. During the period of recruitment, six applicants resigned before attempting an interview in the field, and one was dismissed because of incompetency. Ultimately 11 applicants completed one or more acceptable interviews. Besides these, two BASPC staff members devoted full time to case readings and to interviewing in private homes and institutions; and another staff member worked full time for a two-month period coordinating the various administrative tasks essential to implementing the interviews in the field.

The temporary employees utilized for interview purposes were given a two-part orientation to the project, supplemented by specific instructions and close supervision by a full-time BASPC staff member. Of the temporary employees,

APPENDIX V (contd.)

those who conducted the most interviews were persons with professional experience in probation or a related field, and, in some cases, were persons who, after professional experience, had returned to a university for graduate work.

Before interviewing the minor, case record information was obtained on such matters as address, age, sex, race, living arrangements, legal status, protection of rights, and dispositions. To insure the confidentiality of the information provided, each minor was assigned a code number, which made possible the linking of the case record information with the interview information, yet protected the identity of the minor. Although the interview schedule for the delinquents and predelinquents was different from the one used in interviewing the dependent minors, it contained identical items on many subjects, particularly on Juvenile Hall, institutional, and foster home experience. Queries here were about activities, quality of food, bad treatment if any, punishment (for cause), rehabilitative counseling, racial discrimination, family visits, fairness of the officials involved with the minor, and medical care. The opening items solely for the delinquents and predelinquents included a question on the authorities responsible for the initial action, the cause of the initial action, protection of the minors' rights, and the disposition closing the initial action. The opening items solely for the dependent minor concerned departure from home, the new place of residence, and experiences in the new residence.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

Mailed Questionnaires

On February 23, 1968, questionnaires were mailed to the total staff of the San Francisco Police Juvenile Bureau, comprising 42 police officers. The purpose was to obtain information about length of experience, motivation for doing the indicated kind of work, education and training, workload, attitude toward the job, and perception of official relationships. Four of this study group did not fill in the questionnaire.

On March 13, 1968, a questionnaire was sent to the Probation Departments of Alameda, Sacramento, and San Bernardino Counties, and to the Juvenile Probation Department of Santa Clara County in California. Similar questionnaires were sent to the jurisdictions of Cook County, Illinois, and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The purpose was to compare selected characteristics of these departments with those of San Francisco's Juvenile Probation Department. The basis for selection of these counties was similarity in size of population and existence of a 1964 study by the California State Board of Corrections which utilized the same California counties for comparison, thereby providing comparisons at a different point in time. Questions covered matters of personnel, budget, volume of service, sources of referral, sizes of caseload, protection of minors' rights, and policies and procedures. Every county returned the questionnaire filled in as requested. One or two difficulties with responses were quickly overcome with telephone calls to the department concerned.

Records of the Juvenile Court Statistical Unit

During the course of the study, the Juvenile Court Statistical Unit provided various members of the study team with hand tabulations of statistical

APPENDIX V (contd.)

data. No computer services are available to this unit, except for whatever is tabulated in Sacramento by the State. The table of organization shows that this unit consists of one statistician and one statistical clerk. Unfortunately, these limitations of computer services and the small number of staff prevented full exploitation of the available records.

Documentary Sources

The sources of documents varied, and included both governmental and non-governmental organizations. The following list was selected from the Bibliography, and is therefore not exhaustive; but it indicates the types and the stature of the organizations utilized as documentary sources.

Federal Government

U.S. Children's Bureau, Department of HEW
The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (President's Crime
Commission Report), with supplemental Task Force Reports

State Government

California Department of Finance
California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics
California Youth Authority

Local Government

Annual Reports, San Francisco Juvenile Court
Annual Reports, San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco City Planning Department

Non-Governmental

California Probation, Parole, and Correctional Assn.
National Council on Crime and Delinquency

C. Limitations

Each method of gathering data had inherent limitations. Understanding this prevents the arousing of expectations beyond what is possible. Consider the following:

1. Exploratory interviews with a large number of knowledgeable persons in the community provided the diversity of ideas that was sought, but did not measure the extent nor the intensity of opinion in the community.
2. Non-participant observation in the physical and social environment of the site of the study provided valuable and intensely personal experiences for staff members. However, only in the study of procedures at intake was an instrument for systematic recording of observations utilized. The effect of the presence of an observer on the behavior of the intake officers can only be a matter of speculation.
3. Interview schedules permitted a rapid collection of information from large numbers of individuals. Limitations here, other matters being equal, come down to the frankness and honesty of the interviewee and the skill and accuracy of the interviewer. Even the most cooperative of individuals conceivably might avoid disclosures that would be personally prejudicial, embarrassing, or threatening, or might describe events that he had misinterpreted to a small or a large degree.

Another problem relates to the numbers of interviews that can be held in any specific sub-study. This difficulty did not arise in

most instances because the numbers involved made it possible to interview all members of the group under consideration. It was a problem, however, in arranging the interviews with the minors, who, because of their numbers, had to be studied on a selective basis. The manner of selecting them did not provide a basis for generalizing to the total caseload on probation, to the total Youth Guidance Center population, nor to the population of juveniles in placement. Nevertheless, minors grouped into significant classes by age, sex, and race could be compared regarding their experiences at critical points in the system. These provided some notions about what may be considered "higher risk" groups, and assisted in the development of judgments about the system.

4. Mailed questionnaires also permit rapid collection of information but without the advantage of an interviewer to insure the comprehension of vague points and the complete answering of every question. That is, the quality of response by some individuals is poor, but also is often improvable to the extent that they can be reached by telephone.
5. Official records and documentary sources are usually only indirectly applicable to the basic problem. If directly applicable to the problem, they pertain to a different county.

Other methods beyond the scope of this study would have to be utilized to accomplish an analysis in depth of the psychological and psychiatric profiles of the staff of Juvenile Hall and the Probation Department; of the subtle but powerful influence of cultural differences on official roles and on client behavior; and of the underlying problems of causation of delinquency and dependency.

APPENDIX VI

RESOURCE PERSONS (162)

In addition to courtesies and services rendered by members of the Study Committee's Technical Advisory Panel and by the Special Consultants, consultation, sometimes written and sometimes oral, was provided by the following individuals during the fact-gathering phase of this study.

Mrs. Robert Adams
Chairman
Contra Costa Juvenile Justice Commission
Lafayette

Charles L. Andersen
Assistant Director
San Francisco Boys' Club
San Francisco

Norman Andreasen
Sr. Deputy Probation Officer
Alameda County, Oakland

Sister Ann
Consultant to Administration
& Director of Public Education
St. Elizabeth's Infant Hospital
San Francisco

Miss Juanita Aranda
Counselor
Mission Rebels
San Francisco

Steven Arian
Staff Attorney
San Francisco Neighborhood
Legal Assistance Foundation
San Francisco

Brother Arnold
Principal
Sacred Heart High School
San Francisco

Honorable Robert K. Barber
Judge, Alameda County Superior Court
Oakland

Harry Barsotti
Principal
Aptos Junior High School
San Francisco

Miss Dolores Bartalini
Institutional Nurse
Alameda County Juvenile Hall
San Leandro

Ronald H. Beattie, Chief
Bureau of Criminal Statistics
Department of Justice
Sacramento

Loren A. Beckley
San Mateo County Chief Probation Officer
Belmont

Rita Bernell - Lieutenant
San Francisco County Jail No. 3
San Francisco

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Robert H. Betzenderfer
Senior Staff Attorney
Legal Aid Society of San Francisco
Juvenile Court Office
San Francisco

Miss Jean Bolton
Executive Director
Florence Crittenton Home
San Francisco

Douglas Booth
Principal
Juvenile Court Schools
Special Education Division
San Mateo County Schools
Belmont

Ronald Born
General Manager
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

Bernard Bradman, M.D.
Assistant Program Chief
Community Mental Health Services
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Erwin H. Braff, M.D.
Director, Bureau of Disease and
Adult Health
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Allen Breed
Director
California Youth Authority
Sacramento

Mrs. Marian Brislane
Division Supervisor
Child Welfare Division
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

Lt. Gus Bruneman
Commanding Officer
Community Relations Unit
San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco

E. Myron Bull, Jr.
Attorney at Law
Chairman, Juvenile Court Committee
San Francisco Bar Association
San Francisco

Walter H. Busher
Chief Probation Officer
Marin County Juvenile Court
San Rafael

James Callahan
Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County
Oakland

Ivor S. Callaway
Principal
Samuel Gompers High School
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Sheriff Michael N. Canlis
San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department
Stockton

Honorable Ross A. Carkeet
Chairman, Juvenile Court Committee of
Conference of California Judges
Judge, Tuolumne County Superior Court
Sonora

Mrs. Carveta Carr
Juvenile Hall Nurse
Contra Costa County Juvenile Hall
Martinez

Robert M. Carter, D. Criminology (resigned)
Research Associate
University of California
Berkeley

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Harry Clervi (retired)
Ex San Francisco Chief Juvenile Probation
Officer
San Francisco

Mrs. Shirley Cooper
Chief Psychiatric Social Worker
Mt. Zion Hospital and Medical Center
San Francisco

Douglas T. Corbin
(former Assistant Public Defender, S.F.)
Referee
Contra Costa County Juvenile Court
Martinez

Lawrence Crowley
Environmental Health Inspector
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Fred Culver
Staff Attorney
Legal Aid Society of San Francisco
Juvenile Court Office
San Francisco

Charles Cunningham
Chief Deputy
San Francisco Jail No. 3
San Francisco

George F. Davis
Senior Social Research Analyst
California Youth Authority
Sacramento

John A. Davis
Contra Costa County Probation Officer
Martinez

Martin Dean
Coordinator
Special Educational Services
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

John DeSoto
San Francisco Civil Service Commission
San Francisco

Mrs. Earlyne DiRusso
Director
Children's Receiving Home
Sacramento

Richard Dixon
Youth Guidance Center School
San Francisco

Miss Harriet G. Dockstader
Director of Group Services
YWCA
San Francisco

Miss Margaret Dombross
Chief Supervisor
Catholic Social Service
San Francisco

Paul Dowdall
Director
Social Service Programs
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

Miss Phyllis Dunne
Executive Director
Catholic Social Service
San Francisco

Norman Ecklund
Director of Recruitment & Examinations
Civil Service Commission
San Francisco

John Ellingston
Professor of Law-Emeritus
University of Minnesota
San Francisco

Christopher Emley
Staff Attorney
Legal Aid Society of San Francisco
Juvenile Court Office
San Francisco

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

T. C. Esselstyn, Ph.D.
Chairman
Department of Humanities and the Arts
San Jose State College
San Jose

Ken Fagan
Community Coordinator
Juvenile Defense and Assistance
San Francisco

Kenneth Fare
Chief Probation Officer
County of San Diego
San Diego

Mrs. Bernice Farley
Chief Psychiatric Social Worker
Child Psychiatric Clinic
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Don Fazackerley
Foreman
San Francisco Grand Jury
San Francisco

Barbara Fisher
Staff Attorney
San Francisco Neighborhood
Legal Assistance Foundation
San Francisco

David Fong
Assistant Chief to Controller
Chief Accountant and Chief of Budget
San Francisco

Honorable Terry A. Francois
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco

Miss Margaret Furnish
Assistant Director of Social Services
Family Division
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

Honorable Samuel W. Gardiner
Judge, Juvenile Court
Marin County Superior Court
San Rafael

Paul Gay
Supervisor, Secondary Division
Junior High Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Honorable Joseph Genser
Judge
Contra Costa County Superior Court
Martinez

Jeff Glen
Associate Legal Counsel
National Council on Crime & Delinquency
New York

Jewel Goddard
Director of Court Services
Hennepin County
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Mrs. Maxine Gonsalves
Youth Guidance Center School
San Francisco

Albert S. Gordon
Director of Juvenile Probation
Alameda County Probation Department
San Leandro

Leonard Gordon
Social Group Worker
Booker T. Washington Community Service Ctr.,
San Francisco

Mrs. Mildred Gould
Division Supervisor
Child Welfare Division
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Mrs. Elaine Wolfe Grady
Social Worker in Charge of
Special Service Centers
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Phil Green
Director, Division of Juvenile
Delinquency Services, and former Chief
Probation Officer, San Francisco
Juvenile Court
U.S. Children's Bureau (Dept. of HEW)
Washington, D.C.

Keith S. Griffiths, Ph.D.
Chief, Division of Research
California Youth Authority
Sacramento

Mrs. Mildred Grosselfinger
Social Worker
Convent of the Good Shepherd
San Francisco

George J. Grubb
General Manager, Personnel Department
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco

Margot Hagaman
Project Coordinator
Juvenile Defense and Assistance
San Francisco

Mrs. Isabelle Hambricht
Associate Demographic Analyst
Department of Finance
Sacramento

David Handlon
Senior Supervisor
Child Welfare Division
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

Thomas E. Harris
Executive Director
Hunters Point Boys' Club
San Francisco

Kenneth Hecht
Staff Attorney
San Francisco Neighborhood Legal
Assistance Foundation
San Francisco

Mrs. Alice Henry
Director, Pupil Services
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Walter P. Hollmann
Senior Demographic Analyst
Department of Finance
Sacramento

Eugene Mason Howell
Public Health Engineer
San Mateo Department of Public Health
and Welfare
San Mateo

Mrs. Nancy Hutchings
Executive Director
Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Association
San Francisco

Richard Janopaul
Attorney at Law
Deputy Public Defender
San Francisco

William D. Jenkins
Attorney in Charge
Juvenile Court Office
Legal Aid Society of San Francisco
San Francisco

Keith Johnson
Senior Supervisor
Child Welfare Division
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

James Jordan
Superintendent
Audy Home for Children
Chicago, Illinois

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

George Karonsky
Principal
Portola Junior High School
San Francisco

The Rev. James Keane
Director
St. Vincent's School for Boys
San Rafael

James Kearney
Supervisor
Secondary Schools (Sr. High Schools)
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

John C. Kelterer
Chief, Bureau of Environmental Health
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Glen W. Kent, M.D.
Acting Health Officer
Health Department
Contra Costa County
Martinez

Michael T. Khlentzos, M.D.
Director
McAuley Neuropsychiatric Institute
St. Mary's Hospital
San Francisco

James Kilkenney
Assistant Principal
Log Cabin Ranch and Hidden Valley Schools
LaHonda, California

Robert A. Kimmich, M.D.
Chairman
Department of Psychiatry
Children's Hospital and Adult Medical
Center of San Francisco
San Francisco

James L. King,
Unit Supervisor
Alameda County Probation Department
San Leandro

Robert Knupfer
Executive Director
Big Brothers, Inc.
San Francisco

Harry M. Krytzer
Principal
Mission High School
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Warde Laidman
Acting Executive Director
Family Service Agency of San Francisco
San Francisco

Richard Lindsey
Pennsylvania Director
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Harrisburg, Pa.

Daniel Loeb
Staff Attorney
San Francisco Neighborhood Legal
Assistance Foundation
San Francisco

Isolde Loewinger, M.D.
Director
Maternal and Child Health
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Joseph D. Lohman
Dean (deceased)
University of California
School of Criminology
Berkeley

Saul Madfes
Principal
Woodrow Wilson High School
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Donald H. Maffly
Attorney at Law
Athearn, Chandler and Hoffman
San Francisco

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Robert J. Matho
United Nations Secretariat
Social Defense Section
New York

Francis W. Mayer
Chief Deputy District Attorney
County of San Francisco
San Francisco

Michael F. McDonnell
Captain
San Francisco County Jail No. 1
San Francisco

Mrs. Jane McKaskle
Deputy Director
Northern Region
California State Department of
Social Welfare
San Francisco

Frank Mele
Administrative Analyst
Contra Costa County Medical Services
Martinez

Ross Miles
Supervisor
Attendance Services
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Harold Muntz
Chief Deputy Probation Officer
Los Angeles County Probation Department
Los Angeles

Mrs. Natalia Neil
Coordinator of Casework Program
Florence Crittenton Home
San Francisco

Robert E. Nino
Chief
Santa Clara County Juvenile Probation
Department
San Jose

John P. O'Brien
Director of Court Services
Cook County Family Court
Chicago, Illinois

Ira Okun
Superintendent (resigned)
Marin County Juvenile Hall
Lucas Valley, San Rafael

George Ososke
Executive Director
California Brewers Association
Ex Chief Probation Officer
San Francisco

Richard Peterson
Delinquency Prevention Officer of
Alameda County
Executive Secretary of Delinquency
Prevention Commission
Oakland

Percy Pinkney
Director of Street Workers
Youth for Service
San Francisco

Werner Plagge
Teacher
Hidden Valley Ranch School
LaHonda

Sgt. Delmar Priest
Commanding Officer
Juvenile Bureau
Richmond Police Department
Richmond

Capt. Daniel Quinlan
Commanding Officer
Juvenile Bureau
San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco

R. James Rasmussen
Crime Studies Analyst
California Bureau of Criminal Statistics
Sacramento

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Miss Josephine Rasori
Assistant Director of Social Services
Child Welfare Division
San Francisco City and County
Department of Social Services
San Francisco

James August
Senior Deputy Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department
Oakland

Hugh H. Redford
President
Barristers Club
Attorney at Law
Morrison, Foerster, Holloway,
Clinton & Clark
San Francisco

Mrs. Shirley A. Reece
Supervising Psychiatric Social Worker
Children's Services
Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute
San Francisco

Frederick Robbins
Chief, Dairy Inspection
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

James Robinson
Principal
Bret Harte Elementary School
San Francisco

Ralph Ross
Executive Director
Homewood Terrace
San Francisco

Thomas H. Rothwell
Chief Counsel
Legal Aid Society of San Francisco
San Francisco

Leslie Russell
Principal
Juvenile Court Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Thomas Sammon
Assistant Principal
Pelton Junior High School
San Francisco

Jack Sanders
Deputy Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department
Oakland

Charles Schimitsky
Chief Law Guardian
Family Court of the State of New York
Juvenile Term
New York

Robert D. Schumacher
Recreation Area Supervisor, Division D
Recreation and Park Department
San Francisco

Leon Seff
Supervising Deputy Probation Officer
County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles

Mrs. Rita Semel
Coordinator
Conference on Race, Religion and Social
Concerns
San Francisco

I. J. Shain
Research Director
California Judicial Court
San Francisco

William Sheridan
Associate Director
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Services
U.S. Children's Bureau (Dept. of HEW)
Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Allan Sielaff
Illinois Director (resigned)
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Chicago, Ill.

Rex Silvernale
Member, Marin Juvenile Justice Commission
San Rafael

Sgt. Eugene Simmons
Community Relations Unit
San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco

George Smith
Assistant to the Director
California Youth Authority
Sacramento

Stewart C. Smith
Chief Probation Officer
County of San Bernardino
San Bernardino

Ellis D. Sox, M.D.
Director of Public Health
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Sgt. Steve Spellman
Police Athletic League
San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco

J. M. Stubblebine, M.D.
Program Chief
Community Mental Health Service
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health
San Francisco

Mrs. Helen Sumner
Assistant Western Director
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
San Francisco

Capt. Odell Sylvester
Commanding Officer
Juvenile Division
Oakland Police Department
Oakland

Thomas Talo
Teacher
Log Cabin Ranch School
LaHonda

Warren E. Thornton
Chief Probation Officer
County of Sacramento
Sacramento

Sister Mary Trinita, R.N., M.S.
Administrative Director
McAuley Neuropsychiatric Institute
St. Mary's Hospital
San Francisco

William Underwood
Consultant
Division of Delinquency Prevention and
Probation Services
California Youth Authority
San Francisco

Lawson Veney
Director of Court Services
Allegheny County Juvenile Court
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Miss Mary Vetter
Director of Casework
Catholic Social Service
San Francisco

Yori Wada
Executive Secretary
Buchanan Street Branch YMCA
San Francisco

Harold Ware
Executive Director
Booker T. Washington Community Serv. Center
San Francisco



C123316408

76 03715
v.7

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

Landis Weaver
Chairman
San Mateo Juvenile Justice Commission
Redwood City

Robert Weber
Director
Information and Referral Center
National Council on Crime and
Delinquency
New York, N.Y.

Harold Weeks
Director of Research
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco

Patrick Westbrook
Youth Guidance Center School
San Francisco

Robert Willis
Dairy Inspector
San Mateo Department of Public Health
and Welfare
San Mateo

Zeppelin W. Wong
Attorney at Law
San Francisco

Sister Zoe
Principal
Cathedral High School
San Francisco

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAR 14 2025

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



